

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 18-20 are amended; Claim 15 is cancelled; and no claims are added herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; Claims 1 and 11 were objected to; Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,346,266 to Mentley; and Claims 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,632,052 to Moeri.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, Claim 12 is amended by the present amendment. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection to Claims 1 and 11, Claims 1 and 11 are amended by the present amendment. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to Claims 1 and 11 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, the claims are amended by the present amendment in order to clarify the features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the merits with respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Mentley and Moeri, in order to expedite issuance of a patent in this case, Applicant has amended the independent claims to clarify patentable distinctions of the present invention over the cited references. Specifically, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to

recite a crowning is formed at both end parts of one tooth surface of at least one gear of a plurality of gears engaging each other, and one crowning is a forged crowning. This feature is similarly recited in Claims 14 and 18 and is supported by the specification with respect to the disclosure regarding Figures 3, 5 and 7 for example. Further, the applied art does not teach or suggest tooth forms of all teeth are unified to one pattern selected from a plurality of patterns in which a crowning is formed, with at least one of four parts of both ends on each tooth surface of said teeth and said crowning, is not formed at one part of said four parts thereof, as recited in Claim 11. Nor does the applied art teach or suggest the particular molding step and location of the crowning as set forth in Claims 19 and 20.

In contrast, Mentley discusses that crowning is formed by cutting a tooth surface with the tool T. As shown in Figs. 2-6 of Mentley, the tool T has teeth which are conjugate to the gear being finished. To finish the teeth of gear G, three relative motions are provided the tool T and gear G, with the machine shown in Fig. 1 rotating the tool T directly with the gear G driven thereby. Moeri discusses that crowning is formed by cutting the tooth surface with a disc milling cutter, as shown in the figures of Moeri. As such, the applied art merely discusses that crowning is formed by cutting and does not show that a crowning is formed at both end parts of one tooth surface thereof and one crowning is a forged, as claimed.

In accordance with the features of the claimed invention, the difficulty of the process for forming a crowning can be reduced, machining time can be shortened, the dispersion of accuracy due to the abrasion of tools and the wastage cost of tools can be reduced, efficiency can be enhanced, and costs can be lowered. The recited features of the claimed invention are different from the discussion of Mentley and Moeri and therefore, the applied art cannot provide at least the advantages discussed above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Mentley and Moeri is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.


Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
KMM/rac



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\26\260917\AMEND DUE 11-18-08.DOC